

APPLICATION NO.

09/772,261

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

FILING DATE

01/29/2001

7590

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. ROC920000268US1 8891 **EXAMINER**

NELSON, FREDA ANN

PAPER NUMBER

07/08/2005 Robert R Williams, Patent Agent IBM Corporation - Department 917 ART UNIT 3605 Highway 52 North Rochester, MN 55901-7829

3639

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR

Gordon James Smith

د ⁄
_

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/772,261	SMITH, GORDON JAMES		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Freda A. Nelson	3639		

Advisory Action	09/772,261	SMITH, GORDON JAMES		
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Freda A. Nelson	3639		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 23 June 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.		
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverset, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o . ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI).	f the final rejection. IRST REPLY WAS FILE	D WITHIN TWO	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened st above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the is after the mailing date of the final rejecti	The appropriate extensic final Office action; or (2) on, even if timely filed, ma	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b) by reduce any	
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	onsideration and/or search (see NC ow);	OTE below);		
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))		ejected claims		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:)	vill be entered and an	explanation of	
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	avit or other evidence	is necessary	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) 13. Other:	. (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)		
10. 1 Out 10. 1	•	- HEMALE	A DIXON	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 4-05)

The request for reconsideration is not persuasive.

The Applicant argues on page 7, lines 7-15, that the Examiner erroneously read "merchandise" to include travel services. Among discloses a system which allows a buyer to mix and match various components of a tour package; and reduces the cost of the tour package by eliminating the middleman (paragraph 0053). Therefore, the examiner believes the merchandise to be components of a tour package. Pugliese was submitted as a secondary reference to show the user entering information with a data storage device.

The Applicant also argues that Among does not teach selling 'tangible merchandise", however, according to "Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 10 Edition", "tangible" means "capable of being identified or realized by the mind". Therefore, components of a tour package are not intangible although the added material "purchasing tangible merchandise" having a "per-unit price" is not supported by the applicant's original disclosure.